



1916

Personals

Kentucky Law Journal

Follow this and additional works at: <https://uknowledge.uky.edu/klj>

Right click to open a feedback form in a new tab to let us know how this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Kentucky Law Journal (1916) "Personals," *Kentucky Law Journal*: Vol. 4 : Iss. 6 , Article 6.

Available at: <https://uknowledge.uky.edu/klj/vol4/iss6/6>

This Comment is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Journals at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in Kentucky Law Journal by an authorized editor of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu.

KENTUCKY LAW JOURNAL

Published Monthly at the University of Kentucky by
students of the College of Law.

F. A. HARRISON, '16	-	-	-	-	-	-	Editor-in-Chief
J. V. CHAMBERLAIN, '17	-	-	-	-	-	-	Associate Editor
R. E. CULLEN, '16	-	-	-	-	-	-	Business Manager
J. W. NORRIS, '17	-	-	-	-	-	-	Assistant Business Manager
F. H. RICKETSON, JR., '17	-	-	-	-	-	-	Junior Business Manager

All subscriptions should be addressed to the Business Manager.

Rates: 15c per copy; one dollar a year; fifty cents for six months.

There appears in this issue two articles written by students in this Department. These articles were chosen as the two best out of a number submitted and they will receive the two prizes donated by the Baldwin Law Book Company of Louisville.

The first prize, "Famous Kentucky Tragedies and Trials," was awarded to Mr. J. T. Gooch, a Senior in this Department. His article was entitled, "Is the plea of Autrefois Acquit for Misdemeanors Justifiable in Kentucky?" Mr. Gooch is from Hanson, Ky., a gentleman of engaging personality, and as this article indicates well versed in the principles of law.

W. J. Kallbrier, of Louisville, was awarded the second prize, "Grider on Judicial Sales." His article dealt with "Trial by Jury," and is a complete history of this arm of the Court. "Bill" is only 19 years of age, but he has already shown that he possesses the "earmarks of a great lawyer." In addition to being a writer of ability, he is a finished debater. He was a member of our last debating team that met and defeated Cincinnati.

On the whole we think that this contest has brought forth articles of worth and has created an interest in writing on legal subjects that did not exist heretofore. We also take this opportunity

of thanking the Baldwin Law Book Company for enabling us to have this contest. We feel sure that our students, our Alumni, and our friends throughout the State appreciate as deeply as we the interest that Baldwin has taken in this State University.

The Kentucky Debating team, outclassing and outfighting their opponents, sent the Cincinnati debating team back to that fair city on the evening of February 11, with the first defeat ever handed the Cincinnati debaters in the history of Intercollegiate debating at Lexington. It was a real Kentucky victory, in a real Kentucky way, with a real Kentucky celebration afterwards. The question "Resolved, that the United States encourage a merchant marine through a discriminatory tariff in favor of goods shipped in American bottoms was upheld by the Kentucky team, composed of W. J. Kallbrier, D. L. McNeil and F. H. Ricketson, Jr. Although this was the first time that any of the team had ever participated in an Intercollegiate debate, they proudly upheld the traditions of Kentucky, and every lawyer in the school undoubtedly feels proud of the masterly defeat they administered the boys from Ohio. But the saddest part of this story is the fact, that while Cincinnati was facing the onslaughts of Kentucky oratory, a team composed of C. T. Dotson, King Swope and T. L. Creekmore were meeting defeat. It was hard for Kentucky to understand the defeat owing to the ability of the three men we sent to Cincinnati. All were veterans of unquestionable ability and all had worked hard and faithfully on the debate. The judges of the local debate were Attorney A. M. Baker, Judge Matthew Walton and M. A. Cassidy.

Hon. Raymond Robins, lawyer, millionaire social worker, and former candidate for the United States Senate, is coming to Kentucky March 28, to open a three-day evangelistic campaign under the supervision of the University Y. M. C. A. Raymond Robins is a lawyer and proud of it. He is a Kentuckian and believes in Kentucky. He is the man that Theodore Roosevelt termed the greatest progressive orator of the day; he is the man that Governor Dunne, of Illinois, deserted his own political party to stump for in the campaign for the United States Senate, and Raymond Robins is the man William Jennings Bryan called the apostle of clean politics. Raymond Robins

is coming to Kentucky with a message. He will make a special appeal to the lawyers, and let us all unite, unite as one, and show Raymond Robins that the lawyers are true exponents of social service and clean politics and are the dominant force in the State University.

On the evening of March 17, the Varsity debating team will meet Centre College in their annual debate for the championship of Kentucky. It is interesting to note that every member of this team is a lawyer, and has previously distinguished himself as a debater. F. A. Harrison and J. V. Chamberlain, are the heroes of last years victory over Cincinnati at Cincinnati. G. C. Wilson, the third member, has acted as alternate in several debates.

The Tau Kappa Alpha, the honorary fraternity of Oratory at Debate, at its annual pledge day in the University chapel, pledged C. T. Dodson, W. J. Killbrier, G. C. Wilson, D. L. McNeill, and F. H. Ricketson, Jr. It is interesting to note that every member pledged for this honorary fraternity is enrolled in the Law Department.

A holiday for the lawyers was declared at the University on March 10, and all of that department paid the Legislature and Court of Appeals in session at Frankfort a visit.

The Tau Kappa Alpha fraternity has offered a beautiful loving cup to the best original oration delivered by any student in the college that is not at present a member of the fraternity. Come on Lawyers, and keep this cup in our department.

Hon. Reuben Hutchcraft, the illustrious member of our Faculty, who at present is devoting his time to law making at Frankfort, reports everything favorable to his new bill on the qualification and examination for the bar.

R. C. Bush, instructor on Corporations, was called to New Orleans March 1, on business.

Edgar H. Dunn, a graduate of this department, and now located at Hyden, Ky., has given himself to equity practice and especially the

settlement of land titles. He is meeting with remarkable success, having won all cases interested in recently.

Mr. V. Y. Moore, one of the most brilliant men that ever graduated from law in this University, and now located at Madisonville, Ky., has recently been nominated by the Republicans for Congress in his district.

S. B. Dishman, '14, is now located at Barbourville, Ky., and doing well.

The staff for the Kentucky Law Journal has been selected for next year. Mr. J. V. Chamberlain, the present Associate Editor, will be Editor-in-Chief, and Mr. F. H. Ricketson, Jr., will be Business Manager. The remainder of the staff will be selected later.

IS THE PLEA OF AUTREFOIS ACQUIT FOR MISDEMEANORS JUSTIFIABLE IN KENTUCKY?

This article, written by J. T. Gooch, a Senior in the Law Department of University of Kentucky, was awarded first prize in the contest conducted by Baldwin Law Book Company of Louisville.

The plea of autrefois acquit involves many questions of mixed law and fact. The purpose of the plea is to prevent any person from being persecuted in the courts. That is, if "A" has been indicted for any offense and brought to trial in a court of proper jurisdiction and acquitted, he cannot be arraigned in court again for that particular offense. The principle of the law is, that is better for ninety and nine persons to go unpunished than for one innocent person to be punished. The same principle is embodied in Sec. 13, of the Constitution of Kentucky, which reads as follows: "No person shall for the same offense be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb."

The question of, "the same offense or identical crime," has perplexed our courts and has afforded much ground for contention among lawyers. The disagreement as to what constitutes "the same